

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-8 and 10-45 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 14, 20, 30, 39 and 45 being the independent claims. New claims 20-45 are sought to be added. Claims 1-19 are amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated July 14, 2004, claims 1-4, 7-9 and 14-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gaines, US Patent No. 5,961,582. Claims 5, 6 and 10-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Allowable Claims 5, 6 and 10-13

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 5, 6 and 10-13.

Interview at the US Patent and Trademark Office of September 29, 2004

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the in-person interview with the Examiner at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. During the interview, a number of terms used in the present applications were discussed, and the differences between the pending claims and the disclosure of Gaines were addressed.

Specifically, as explained during the interview, Gaines does not disclose a distributed file system, virtual environments, computer clusters, control center, or

provision of hosting services. As a result of the discussion, the Examiner indicated that he understood the differences, but requested better definition of at least some of the differences in the claims. Although Applicants continue to believe that the claims are allowable without further substantive amendments for the reasons discussed during the interview, nonetheless, in order to avoid unnecessary controversy and advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants have amended the pending claims, and added additional claims, specifically directed to the aspects discussed during the interview.

For example, independent claims 1 and 7 now recite **virtual environments that do not require a dedicated memory**. As discussed during the interview, the system as disclosed in Gaines would inherently require dedication of portions of memory to each virtual environment, even assuming there were virtual environments in Gaines (which there are not).

Independent claims 14 and 39 recite that the **distributed file system is one with a common name space**. As discussed during the interview, Gaines discloses a system where each node has its own file system, with its own name space. It is possible for Gaines to have multiple files all having an identical name and path. In a distributed file system (which inherently requires a common name space), files must have unique file names.

Independent claims 20, 30 and 45 recite “providing hosting services.” Examples of such services are discussed in the specification, at page 10, paragraph 1026. These examples include web services, email services, FTP services, streamers, X servers, etc. (although it should be understood that the invention is not limited to provision of these particular hosting services.) As

discussed during the interview, Gaines says nothing about provision of hosting services.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

A number of claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Gaines. The amendments discussed above, which generally follow the discussion during the interview at the United States Patent and Trademark Office, address the § 102(b) rejections. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

New Claims 20-45

New claims 20-45 have been added to provide additional coverage for the invention. Support for the language of the claims may be found in the originally pending claims, as well as throughout the specification. These claims are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above, as well as due to the features recited therein.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is
respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



George S. Bardmesser
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,020

Date: 16/18/04

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

296399_1.DOC